

# Clean Water Act Section 319 Competitive Grant Proposals Evaluation Factors



## Ranking Committee Evaluation Review Sheet

Evaluation Factors	Weight	Score
<i>Rank with score of 0 to 5. (Weight x Value = Score) Maximum score 825.</i>		
The extent, and quality, to which the subcategories of NPS pollution are identified and described.	15	
The extent, and quality, to which the water quality problems or threats to be addressed are identified and described.	15	
The extent, and quality, to which the goals and objectives of the project specifically identify the project location and activities to be implemented.	20	
The extent to which significant water quality benefits will be achieved as a result of the project.	20	
The specificity of the budget in relation to each work plan component.	15	
The level of detail in relation to the schedule for achieving the activities in the work plan.	15	
The extent to which the roles and responsibilities of the recipient and project partners in carrying out the work plan activities are specifically identified.	15	
The extent to which the performance evaluation process meets each of the following sub-criteria: (i) Demonstrates environmental results, anticipated outputs and outcomes, and how the outcomes are linked to EPA's Strategic Plan; (ii) Demonstrates a sound plan for measuring progress towards achieving expected outcomes and outputs; and (iii) Documentation of progress towards achieving the expected results under Federal agency assistance agreements within last 3 years.	15	
The extent, and quality, to which the proposal addresses one of the four factors regarding the watershed-based plan and watershed project implementation.	35	2

## Evaluation Factor #1

- The extent, and quality, to which the subcategories of NPS pollution are identified and described.
  - Identifies NPS sources at the subcategory level with estimates of the extent to which these subcategories are present in the watershed.
  - Example: # of linear miles of eroded streambank needing remediation; # of acres of Tamarisk to be removed and land revegetated; # of feet of fencing to prevent livestock access to polluted waterbody.

3

## Evaluation Factor #2

- The extent, and quality, to which the water quality problems or threats to be addressed are identified and described.
  - Example: Specifically describes the water quality problems or threats in relation to impairments to water quality standards or other parameters that indicate stream health (decreases in fish or macroinvertebrate counts).
  - Provide water quality data and information from the CWA Section 106 monitoring program that shows the water quality parameter to be addressed.

4



### Evaluation Factor #3

- The extent, and quality, to which the goals and objectives of the project specifically identify the project location and activities to be implemented.
  - Specifically identifies where the NPS project will take place and the waterbody affected by the NPS pollutants (provides good, clear map).
  - Provides details on the specific activities that will be implemented (identifies specific, detailed information on BMPs to be implemented).
  - Recommend using a work plan chart and supplement with narrative description in proposal.

5

### Evaluation Factor #4

- The extent to which significant water quality benefits will be achieved as a result of the project.
  - Incorporate specific water quality-based goals that are linked to: water quality standards for one or more pollutants/uses; measurable, in-stream reductions in a pollutant; or improvements in a parameter that indicates stream health (e.g., increases in fish or macroinvertebrate counts).
  - If information is not available to make specific estimates, water quality-based goals may include narrative descriptions and best professional judgment based on existing information.
  - Build upon information provided for Evaluation Factor #2 on what the expected water quality improvement will be for the water quality parameter to be addressed (provide data estimates).

6

## Evaluation Factor #5

- The specificity of the budget in relation to each work plan component.
  - Provides budget breakdown for each work plan component.
  - Outlines total operational and construction costs of the project (including match funds).
  - Budget categories may include, but not limited to: personnel; travel; equipment; supplies; contractual; construction costs; and other.

7

## Evaluation Factor #6

- The level of detail in relation to the schedule for achieving the activities identified in the work plan.
  - Provides schedule of activities for each work plan component.
  - Identifies a specific “start” and “end” date for each work plan component.
  - Identifies the interim milestone dates for achieving each work plan component.
  - Indicates “readiness to proceed.”

8

## Evaluation Factor #7

- The extent to which the roles and responsibilities of the recipient and project partners in carrying out the work plan activities are specifically identified.
  - Clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of each responsible party for each work plan component.
  - Defines specific level of effort for responsible parties for each work plan component.
  - Identifies an estimate of the specific work years for each staff person for each work plan component.
  - Identifies parties who will take the lead in carrying out the work plan commitments.
  - Identifies other programs, parties, and agencies that will provide additional technical and/or financial assistance.

9

## Evaluation Factor #8

- The extent to which the performance evaluation process meets each sub-criteria:
  - a. Demonstrates environmental results, anticipated outputs and outcomes, and how outcomes are linked to EPA's Strategic Plan.
  - b. Demonstrates a sound plan for measuring progress towards achieving expected outcomes and outputs.
  - c. Documentation of progress towards achieving expected results under Federal agency assistance agreements within last 3 years.

10



## Evaluation Factor #9

- The extent, and quality, to which the proposal addresses one of the following four factors:
  - (1) The work plan develops a watershed-based plan and implements a watershed-based plan.
  - (2) The work plan develops a watershed-based plan and implements a watershed project (that does not implement a watershed-based plan).
  - (3) The work plan implements a watershed-based plan.
  - (4) The work plan implements a watershed project that is a significant step towards solving NPS impairments or threats on a watershed-wide basis.

11

## Case Study: Developing a Competitive Proposal

Tom Morris, Navajo Nation

